REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Status of Claims:

Claims 2-4, 7-9 and 12-14 are currently being cancelled.

Claims 1, 6, 11 and 18 are currently being amended.

Claim 22 is currently being added.

This amendment and reply amends, adds and cancels claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claims remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending, adding and canceling the claims as set forth above, claims 1, 6, 11 and 16-22 are pending in this application.

Claim Objections:

In the Office Action, claims 1, 6, 11 and 18 were objected to for the reasons set forth on page 2 of the Office Action. These claims have been amended to replace the commas with semi-colons, thereby overcoming the objection to these claims.

35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd Paragraph Rejection of the Claims:

In the Office Action, claims 1-4, 6-9 and 11-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph, as being indefinite, for the reasons set forth on pages 2 and 3 of the Office Action. Claims 1, 6 and 11 have been amended to overcome this indefiniteness rejection, whereby all of the presently pending claims are believed to fully comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph.

Claim Rejections – Prior Art:

In the Office Action, claims 1-4, 6-9, 11-14 and 16-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0049790 to Ricker et al. in

view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0049790 to Chen et al. This rejection is traversed with respect to the presently pending claims under rejection, for at least the reasons given below.

With respect to Chen, that reference describes a system that presents a user with a hierarchical tree structure representation of a document to allow the user to select data groups rules to be followed. From those rules, a modified hierarchical tree structure is created. See Abstract of Chen.

The Office Action asserts that paragraph 0075 and paragraph 0096 of Ricker teach storing extracted data in a memory in a hierarchical manner according to whether the extracted segment is segment data, transaction set data, functional group data, or attribute data. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assertion. Namely, paragraph 0075 of Ricker describes the flowchart shown in Figure 2 of Ricker, in which an EDI document is inputted into a transformation engine, a tag is selected from a data dictionary and used to designate an XML element in an XML document, whereby a transaction set header can be distinguished in a known manner in accordance with an appropriate EDI standard. There is nothing in this paragraph of Ricker concerning the storage of data in a memory in a hierarchical manner according to whether the extracted segment is segment data, transaction set data, functional group data, or attribute data.

Paragraph 0096 of Ricker describes the flowchart shown in Figure 3 of Ricker, in which an EDI document is input into a transformation engine, a tag structure is read from a data dictionary and is used to designate an XML element in an XML document, whereby a transaction set header can be distinguished in a known manner in accordance with an appropriate EDI standard. There is nothing in this paragraph of Ricker concerning the storage of data in a memory in a hierarchical manner according to whether the extracted segment is segment data, transaction set data, functional group data, or attribute data.

Accordingly, since Chen does not rectify the above-mentioned deficiencies of Ricker, presently pending claim 1, as well as presently pending claims 6 and 11 which recite similar features, are patentable over the combined teachings of those two references.

Furthermore, claim 1 recites:

assigning an attribute to each of the extracted data stored in the memory; and

storing, in the memory, the assigned attributes and linking the assigned attributes to each of the extracted data stored in the memory;

wherein the at least one functional group and the at least one transaction set extracted from the EDI document are stored in the memory with a common attribute.

Such features are not taught or suggested by Ricker, which is the reference cited in the Office Action with respect to those features. Namely, the Office Action asserts that paragraphs 0059, 0075, 0096 and 0099 of Ricker teach these features. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

While paragraphs 0075 and 0096 of Ricker describe a tag structure that is read from a data dictionary and is used to designate an XML element in an XML document, this does not correspond to an attribute that is assigned to each extracted data stored in a memory, in which the assigned attributes are linked to each of the extracted data stored in the memory. Rather, the tag structure of Ricker is merely used to designate XML elements in an XML document, and thus falls well short of the above-recited features of claim 1. Paragraph 0059 of Ricker describes that any XML document can be represented as a tree structure, with a root element and child elements, but this falls well short of teaching an attribute that is assigned to each extracted data stored in a memory, in which the assigned attributes are linked to each of the extracted data stored in the memory. Also, paragraph 0099 of Ricker describes that the definition for each transaction set, segment and element in a data dictionary is stored in its own XML document and can be referenced by multiple parent items, with external links that are indicted by segment and element references. This does not teach or suggest linking attributes to each extracted data stored in a memory, and furthermore it does not teach or suggest storing at least functional group and at least one transaction set from an EDI document in a memory with a common attribute.

Accordingly, since Chen does not rectify the above-mentioned deficiencies of Ricker, presently pending claim 1, as well as presently pending claims 6 and 11 which recite similar features, are patentable over the combined teachings of those two references, for these additional reasons.

With respect to the rejection of claim 16, paragraph 0011 of Chen describes that a GUI tool is provided to allow a user to make different groupings for data. Column 0041 of Chen describes more features of the GUI tool, which allows a user to click on any leaf node to choose

grouping options. Column 0045 of Chen describes a translator, which receives an EDI document and translates it into a translated DOM instance of XML document.

Nowhere do these cited portions of Chen teach or suggest a GUI that allows a user to select a particular document shell (e.g., a purchase order invoice shell) for which data retrieved is to be inputted, and to place the extracted data into the user-selected document shell. Rather, in Chen, the data is stored in a memory, and no creation of a different type of document (with the help of a GUI to allow the user to select a shell for that different type of document) is taught or suggested.

Accordingly, claim 16, as well as claims 18 and 20 which recite similar features, are patentable over the combination of Ricker and Chen, beyond the reasons given above for their respective base claim.

New Claim:

New claim 22 has been added to recite features described, for example, on page 16 of the specification, whereby such features are believed to provide a separate basis of patentability for that claim.

Conclusion:

Since all of the issues raised in the Office Action have been addressed in this Amendment and Reply, Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and an early indication of allowance is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date *November 15, 2006*   By *Phillip J. Articola*

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP   William T. Ellis
Washington Harbour   Registration No. 26,874
3000 K Street, N.W., Suite 500
Washington, D.C. 20007-5143   Phillip J. Articola
Telephone: (202) 672-5485   Registration No. 38,819
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399